

## MEASURING PROFICIENCY IN STANDARD INDONESIAN FOR ENGGANO SPEAKERS

Rindu Parulian Simanjuntak\*  
SIL International, Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia  
parulian\_82@yahoo.com

### Abstract

*The main purpose of study described in this paper was to measure the proficiency of Standard Indonesian spoken in Enggano Island, Bengkulu Province, Indonesia. Enggano is spoken in six villages: Malakoni, Apoho, Meok, Ka'ana, Kayapu and Banjar. Of these, two villages — Meok and Ka'ana — were selected as research sites for collecting data. The instruments used were the Indonesian Sentence Repetition Test (ISRT) (Hanawalt 2008) and a set of bilingualisms questionnaire. The results show an average bilingual proficiency in Standard Indonesian of level 2 on the ILR scale (Interagency Language Roundtable 2007) for Enggano speakers, which indicates an ability to use Indonesian limited to particular situations and domains. The analysis also shows that bilingual proficiency in Enggano varies on average between males and females and is influenced by education and age, but not by the other factors investigated. This means that bilingual proficiency in Standard Indonesian for Enggano speakers is largely the result of continuing on to higher levels of education. Even though the average proficiency of Enggano speakers in Standard Indonesian is at level 2, the attitudes of most Enggano speakers towards both the Indonesian language and the local vernacular language are strongly positive.*

Keywords: *bilingual proficiency*

### Abstrak

*Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengukur tingkat kemahiran berbahasa Indonesia standar yang dituturkan di Pulau Enggano, Propinsi Bengkulu, Indonesia. Bahasa Enggano dituturkan di enam desa: Malakoni, Apoho, Meok, Ka'ana, Kayapu dan Banjar. Dua desa — Meok dan Ka'ana — dipilih sebagai tempat untuk mengambil data-data. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah Tes Pengulangan Kalimat (TPK) dalam bahasa Indonesia atau Indonesian Sentence Repetition Test (ISRT) (Hanawalt 2008) dan seperangkat kuesioner kedwibahasaan. Hasil penelitian mengungkapkan, rata-rata kemahiran berbahasa Indonesia standar lisan masyarakat Enggano di level 2 pada tingkat ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable 2007), mengindikasikan keterbatasan kemampuan berbahasa Indonesia dalam situasi dan ranah tertentu. Hasil analisis juga menunjukkan rata-rata kemahiran kedwibahasaan antara pria dan wanita berbeda karena dipengaruhi oleh pendidikan dan usia, tetapi tidak dengan faktor-faktor lain. Artinya, hasil kemahiran kedwibahasaan bahasa Indonesia standar lisan pada penutur Enggano dapat digunakan untuk melanjutkan ke jenjang pendidikan yang lebih tinggi, dan sikap penutur Enggano pada bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Enggano sangat positif.*

Kata kunci: *kemahiran berbahasa Indonesia*

### INTRODUCTION

In the Indonesian context, most people use Indonesian as a medium for communication in formal situations, while vernacular languages are used in informal situations and isolated areas. The country currently faces the challenge of how to maintain both Indonesian and vernacular languages. A large number of Indonesians speak both a vernacular language (L1) and Indonesian (L2), and many also speak an international language. Thus, most people in Indonesia are bilingual or multilingual. Limited research has been conducted to quantitatively measure the



According to Ethnologue (Gordon 2005:435), Enggano [eno], or Engganese (its alternate name), is classified as Enggano, Sumatera, Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian. It is spoken on Enggano Island and on four smaller nearby islands. No other languages are reported to be closely related to it. Gumono reported in his paper, entitled *Upaya Pemeliharaan Bahasa Daerah yang terancam punah: Kondisi Kebahasaan, Sikap Bahasa, dan kebutuhan bahasa masyarakat Pulau Enggano*, that Indonesian and Enggano both are spoken by Enggano speakers over 40-years-old. Gumono states that Enggano people prefer to speak Indonesian to Enggano due to negative attitude towards their vernacular language. Furthermore, they feel inferior to other cultures brought from outside of the island. Despite this, Enggano people want to keep both Indonesian and vernacular language. Indonesian is seen as useful for increasing their income in the future and vernacular is seen as necessary to be maintained in order that the culture of Enggano could be passed on to the younger generation.

## METHODOLOGY

A Sentence Repetition Test (SRT) is a type of bilingualism test for large-scale assessment of second-language (L2) proficiency. It is used to gain an objective and general assessment of a person's proficiency in a second language, not an in-depth analysis of one person's strengths or weaknesses in that L2 (Radloff 1991:8). The Indonesian Sentence Repetition Test (ISRT) score has been calibrated against the OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview), which is considered as one of the most reliable tests in measuring the bilingual proficiency (see Hanawalt 2008). The OPI was first used by the United States Foreign Service Institute (FSI) to evaluate an individual's L2 proficiency (Radloff 1991: 47). In the OPI, an individual's proficiency in L2 is described with a range of ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable) levels from 0 (No Performance) to 5 (Master Professional Performance). The correlation between ISRT score and ILR level as measured by the OPI is shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Correlation Between ISRT Score and ILR Level (Hanawalt 2008:18)**

ISRT Total Score	OPI (ILR) Level
0-4	0
5-7	0.6 (0+)
8-12	1
13-15	1.6 (1+)
16-20	2
21-24	2.6 (2+)
25-29	3
30-32	3.6 (3+)
33-37	4
38-40	4.6 (4+)
41-54	5

The Indonesian SRT consists of 15 sentences in Indonesian. Each sentence has an assigned point value. The total possible score on the ISRT is 54. The respondent being tested listens to the sentences one by one and repeats each sentence immediately after hearing it (Radloff 1991:7) and is scored on his or her ability to repeat the sentence exactly. Before starting the test, the respondent is allowed to practice with 3 example sentences. If the score of the respondent is low up to the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence, the interviewer does not need to continue the test. SRT tests have some advantages for assessment of community L2, such as short administration and scoring time with only a few personnel required, the fact that it can be administered even by researchers who only have rudimentary proficiency of the language being tested (provided that he/she has received proper training, and the fact that testing procedures are easy to understand.

The test also follows the natural tendency of people to repeat what they hear, and it can eliminate cultural and social constraints (for example, the subject need not to be isolated from the group). Once developed and calibrated, an SRT can be used without further modification wherever bilingualism in that particular language is a question (Radloff 1991:6-7).

### **Survey Procedures**

Two research tools were used to gather data to fulfill the research goal: a Bilingualism questionnaire, and the ISRT (Indonesian Sentence Repetition Test). The questionnaire contained a series of personal demographic questions for the respondent (see Appendix 1). Verbal consent was obtained from the respondent before the questionnaire was administered. Explanations of the questionnaire and the SRT usually took place in Indonesian. However, if the respondent was not sufficiently fluent in Indonesian to understand or reply in Indonesian, a local guide translated the explanation into the Enggano language.

### **Sampling**

Random sampling was applied in each level of the sampling procedures to ensure the validity and representativeness of the collected data. At the village level, stratified random sampling was used by classifying the villages into two categories.

#### *Village Sampling*

The villages that were selected as research sites in Enggano are the ones where, according to the information gathered prior to the research in 2008 and confirmed afterwards, at least 75% of the residents who were native Enggano speakers. Based on this criterion, two out of six villages of Enggano were selected. They are Meok and Ka'ana. In our larger study of bilingualism in Bengkulu province, representative research site villages were randomly selected from two groups: villages located 10km or less to the nearest high school and villages located 20km or more to the nearest high school. This selection was made to see if the distance to the nearest school influences bilingual proficiency. However, there were no high schools in Meok and Ka'ana, so both villages selected as research sites where it located more than 20 km from the nearest high school.

#### *Household Sampling*

A systematic sampling method was used. Households were chosen by totaling the number of houses in the village of Meok and Ka'ana, and dividing that by the number of respondents needed. The total respondents were tested was 62, which 27 in Ka'ana, and 35 in Meok. For example, if there were 150 houses in a village, 150 were divided by 30 and so every 5<sup>th</sup> house was chosen. If the residents of a household were not originally from Enggano island, the next house was chosen.

#### *Respondent Sampling*

A respondent between the ages of 15 to 60 was selected in each household using the KISH grid (see Appendix 3). If the respondent chosen was not originally from the Enggano language group (e.g. Javanese or Sundanese who married into the family), this person was not accepted as a respondent, and the next person indicated by the KISH grid was tested. A person was deemed an acceptable respondent if he/she met the following requirements: at least one parent was a native speaker of the local language, the local language was the respondent's first language, the respondent was physically and mentally able to take the test, and the respondent was willing to take the test.

## RESULTS

### Average BI Proficiency

The overall average OPI or ILR levels (see Appendix 2) for BI bilingual proficiency of the Enggano is on level 2 (Limited Working Performance). According to the International Language Roundtable (2007) a person with language proficiency of level 2 is able to converse about routine or predictable subject matter, but sometimes require repetition or clarification.

**Table 2. Percentage of Respondents with BI Proficiency at ILR Level 3**

Language	Percentage of respondents at or above ILR3	Percentage of respondents below ILR3
Enggano	21%	79%

The above table shows the percentage of Enggano respondents who are at or above ILR 3 in BI. Less than one-third of the population in all clusters is at or above ILR 3 (Professional Performance). The Enggano language group is therefore not predicted to be adequately proficient to use language materials exclusively in BI as defined in Sanders (2004): “80% or more of a cross-section of the language community (ages 20-45) speak a second language (L2) at a proficiency level of 3+ or above and this second language is used in a sustainable manner.” Thus, vernacular language materials may have benefit for the Enggano community.

### *Social and Demographic Factors*

Based on information about the respondents gathered using the sociolinguistics questionnaire, ten factors were investigated as potential correlates with BI proficiency: years of education, age, exposure to literature, length of time spent outside the Enggano community, gender, distance of the respondent's village from school, frequency of travel, exposure to radio, contact with outsiders, and exposure to television. All the data were entered into electronic format, and then analyzed using the EPI software package.

For most of the independent variables mentioned above, respondents were asked questions about the frequency that they engage in related activities (watching television or traveling outside of Enggano island, for example). They were then assigned by the analysts to frequency groups in the categories “never”, “seldom”, “sometimes”, and “often”. There were four exceptions. For years of education, respondents were asked how many years they had spent in school and these numerical values were used. For age, we used the respondents' reported age. For gender there were two categories, male and female. For distance from school, we categorized respondents into two groups: those who live 10km or less to the nearest high school and those who live 20km or more to the nearest of high school. As mentioned above, all of the villages on Enggano are more than 20 km away from the nearest high school. As a last step, before statistical analysis was conducted, non-numerical data was converted to numerical codes to facilitate the analysis.

The EPI software package was used to conduct multiple variable regression analysis to find the correlation between the dependent variable (ISRT score) and independent variables (years of education, age, exposure to literature, length of time spent outside the community, gender, distance from school, travel frequency, exposure to radio, contact with outsiders, and exposure to television) and also to determine which of the factors investigated had an influence on BI proficiency.

As shown in Table 3 below, the factors investigated can be grouped into two categories. If the p-value resulting from the multiple variable regression analysis is less than 0.05, the factor is considered to have a statistically significant relationship with ISRT score, and if the p-value is greater than 0.05 the relationship between this factor and ISRT score is considered statistically insignificant.

**Table 3.**  
**Results of Multiple Variable Regression Analysis for Relationship with BI Proficiency**

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>Std Error</u>	<u>F-test</u>	<u>P-Value</u>
<b>Years of Education</b>	<b>1.266</b>	<b>0.136</b>	<b>86.6471</b>	<b>0.000000</b>
<b>Age</b>	<b>-0.086</b>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>5.6390</b>	<b>0.018142</b>
Exposure to Literature	0.683	0.411	2.7689	0.097068
Contact with	0.389	0.287	1.8315	0.176882
Gender	0.503	0.828	0.3698	0.543534
Distance From School	-0.035	0.093	0.1409	0.707676
Travel Frequency	-0.101	0.465	0.0469	0.828677
Exposure to Radio	0.047	0.329	0.0204	0.886526
Contact with Outsiders	0.014	0.119	0.0138	0.906444
Exposure to Television	0.039	0.489	0.0062	0.937037

#### **Statistically Significant Factors**

Of factors investigated, there are only two statistically significant factors which were shown to influence respondents' ISRT results: years of education and age.

#### *Years of Education*

The multiple regression analysis showed a positive correlation between years of education and bilingual proficiency in Indonesia. In the following presentation of the data, level of education is divided into four levels, as shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4. Categories for Level of Education**

<u>Level of Education</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Years of Education</u>
Elementary	7-12	1-6
Junior High School	13-15	7-9
Senior High School	16-18	10-12
University	19 or more	13 or more

Table 4 shows most children finished their education until Senior High School. Averagely, the children spent three years for the level of Elementary, Junior High School, and Senior High School. Only few students continued their studies to the higher level of education, such as college or university.

**Table 5. ILR Levels by Education**

<u>Level of Education</u>	<u>Enggano ILR Level</u>
Elementary	1+
Junior High	2
Senior High	2+
University	*

Table 5 shows ILR level of Indonesian proficiency for respondents by education in Enggano. The average proficiency level in Indonesia was level 1+ for respondents with education up to SD, level 2 for respondents with education up to SMP, and level 2+ for respondents with education up to SMU. This means that the bilingual proficiency level is apparently increasing when respondents have higher levels of education. For the people who had an opportunity to continue their studies, proficiency in Indonesian was somewhat higher; whereas proficiency in Indonesian was lower when respondents had little or no opportunity to continue their studies. Thus in the study sample, BI proficiency increases with

increasing education. Therefore, education is very significant, and has a strong influence on Indonesian proficiency for the respondents in the study.

#### *Age*

In Table 6 below, the respondents were divided into two age groups: Young and Old. The Young group was defined as respondents between 15 and 35 years old. The Old group was defined as respondents between 36 and 60 years old. It is likely that the difference in BI proficiency between the two age groups is caused by variance in level of education. In general, most young people who were between ages 15 and 35 had attended school for 9 years or more, up to the SMP level (junior high school), while the older people who were between ages 36-60 had attended school for less than 9 years or had never been to school.

**Table 6. ILR Levels by Age**

Age	ILR level
Young	2+
Old	1+

On average individuals in the Young group are more proficient in BI than those in the Old group. The Young group had an average BI proficiency of ILR level of 2+ while the Old groups had an average BI proficiency of ILR level of 1+.. In Table 3, the coefficient value for the independent variable age is negative, meaning that higher age correlates with lower SRT score.

#### **Statistically Insignificant Factors**

Eight of the ten social and demographic factors investigated in this study were shown to be statistically insignificant and were not proven to influence BI bilingual proficiency in the study sample. These factors were: exposure to literature, length of time spent outside community, gender, distance from school, travel frequency, exposure to radio, contact with outsiders, and exposure to television.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Education plays an essential role in the life of Enggano speakers, and also has a strong factor in increasing bilingual Indonesian proficiency. In the study sample it appears that higher levels of education increase a person's bilingual proficiency in Indonesian. Even though the average level of Indonesian proficiency for Enggano speakers can be described as Limited Working Performance (level 2), their attitudes towards both Indonesian and the local vernacular language are strongly positive. This can be seen from their motivation to still uses Indonesian in the domains of education and government while using the vernacular is mostly in the domain of home. Additionally, for Enggano speakers, Indonesian is used for continuing higher education, while the vernacular needs to be maintained as part of Enggano culture so that it can be passed on to the younger generation.

#### **NOTE**

\* I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for very helpful comments on the earlier draft.

\*\* This research was conducted when the writer worked for SIL International Indonesia from 2006-2012.

\*\*\* The writer also would like to thank to the research teams that I could not mention their names one by one. They were from different institutions that helped the writer gathering the data, creating the map and doing data entry.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gordon, Raymond G, ed. 2005. *Ethnologue, languages of the world*. 15<sup>th</sup> ed. Dallas: SIL International, 435.
- Gumono. 2008. Upaya Pemeliharaan Bahasa Daerah yang Terancam Puna: Deskripsi Kondisi Kebahasaan, Sikap Bahasa, dan Kebutuhan Bahasa Masyarakat Pulau Enggano. FKIP Universitas Bengkulu (Accessed on <http://fs.unitomo.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/daftar-makalah-semna-uny-2008.do>), April 4, 2009
- Hanawalt, Charlie. 2008. *The development of the Indonesian Sentence Repetition Test*. Jakarta: SIL International-Indonesia. Unpublished draft.
- <http://www.ppmibengkulu.org/?p21>. Post by admin | Wisata Bengkulu |, accessed on Saturday, April 4, 2009
- Interagency Language Roundtable. 2007. *ILR skill level descriptions for interpretation performance*. URL: <http://www.govtilr.org/Skills/interpretationSLDsapproved.htm>
- Sanders, Chip and IDB Academic Team. 2004. Towards an IDB policy on language project planning in multilingual settings: IDB Academic Team meeting. SIL International, Indonesian.
- Sugondo, Dendy., Mahsun., Inyo., Kisyani., Multamia., Nadra., and Ferry, ed. 2008. *Bahasa-Bahasa di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa. Unpublished draft.
- Radloff, Carla F. 1991. *Sentence Repetition Testing for studies of community bilingualism*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.



**APPENDIX 1: SOCIOLINGUISTIC QUESTIONNAIRE**

A. Kuesioner Penjajakan Dwibahasa

#Responden

Tanggal: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
 Lokasi: Desa \_\_\_\_\_ Kec \_\_\_\_\_ Kab \_\_\_\_\_  
 Pewawancara: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Pengamat: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Penerjemah BD: \_\_\_\_\_  
 1. Biodata  
 Nama lengkap: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Umur: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jenis kelamin: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Pekerjaan: \_\_\_\_\_

Apakah Anda sudah menikah? Y/T

Pendidikan formal: Y/T

Berapa lama: \_\_\_\_ tahun

SD							SMP				SMA			D3
1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	1	2	3			

Tempat dilahirkan:

Tempat dibesarkan:

Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan pertama kali waktu kecil?

Dari suku apa ayah Anda berasal?

Bahasa apa yang paling sering ayah Anda gunakan dengan Anda?

Dari suku apa ibu Anda berasal?

Bahasa apa yang paling sering ibu Anda gunakan dengan Anda?

Dari suku apa pasangan (suami/istri) Anda berasal?

Bahasa apa yang digunakan pasangan Anda dengan Anda?

Bahasa apa yang Anda gunakan sehari-hari di rumah?

Apakah Anda bisa berbahasa yang lain? Y/T

1.18. Dari semua bahasa yang Anda bisa, apa bahasa yang paling lancar: \_\_\_\_\_

kedua: \_\_\_\_\_

ketiga: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Kontak

2.1. Tempat tinggal di luar wilayah bahasa

Apakah Anda pernah tinggal di luar daerah ini? Y/T

Jika ya, berapa lama? (Catat yang lebih dari 6 bulan)

Bahasa apa yang digunakan di daerah itu? \_\_\_\_\_

2.2. Perjalanan (\*Tuliskan semua jawaban dalam tabel yang disediakan di bawah)

Apakah Anda sering pergi ke luar daerah ini? Y/T

Ke mana Anda pergi?

Berapa sering Anda pergi ke sana? (sethar beb/mng 1x/mng 2x/bln 1x/bln <1x/bln)

Bahasa apa yang digunakan di daerah itu?

Apa tujuan Anda biasanya pergi ke sana?

- b. Lokasi                      c. Frekuensi                      d. Bahasa                      e. Tujuan perjalanan

2.3. Apakah Anda mempunyai tetangga atau teman yang tidak berasal dari [suku setempat]?

Y/T

Jika ya, bahasa apa yang Anda biasanya gunakan dengan mereka? \_\_\_\_\_

Seberapa sering Anda bertemu mereka? Sering                      Kadang-kadang                      Jarang

3. Media

3.1. Radio/TV

Apakah Anda sering mendengarkan Radio? Y/T

Jika ya, seberapa sering?                      Sering                      Kadang-kadang                      Jarang

Siaran apa yang biasanya Anda dengarkan di radio? \_\_\_\_\_

Siaran-siaran tersebut biasanya dalam bahasa apa? \_\_\_\_\_

Apakah Anda mengerti siaran tersebut? \_\_\_\_\_

Apakah Anda sering menonton TV? Y/T

Jika ya, seberapa sering?                      Sering                      Kadang-kadang                      Jarang

Siaran apa yang biasanya Anda dengarkan? \_\_\_\_\_

Siaran-siaran tersebut biasanya dalam bahasa apa? \_\_\_\_\_

Apakah Anda mengerti siaran tersebut? \_\_\_\_\_

3.2. Buku dan Bacaan

Apakah Anda suka membaca? Y/T

a. Jika ya, seberapa sering?                      Sering                      Kadang-kadang                      Jarang

b. Jenis bacaan apa ada di rumah ini:

Jenis bacaan                      Bahasa                      Mengerti (Y/T)

Surat kabar, majalah

Al'Quran/Alkitab

Buku tentang agama

Cerita (fiksi/nonfiksi)

Komik

Bacaan di poster, Kalendar, dll

Buku petunjuk

Buku kesehatan

Kamus

Surat, pesan, email, SMS

Brosur, pengumuman

Peta, sketsa/gambar

Rekening atau faktur

Jumlah                      BI \_\_\_\_\_ BD \_\_\_\_\_ dll \_\_\_\_\_                      Ya \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX 2: ILR LEVEL DESCRIPTORS (Interagency Language Roundtable 2007)**

ILR level	Attribute	Description
0	No Performance	No functional ability to transfer information from one language to another.
0+	Memorized Performance	Unable to transfer more than isolated words.
1	Minimal Performance	Unable to transfer more than isolated short phrases.
1+	Minimal Performance Plus	Unable to transfer information reliably, even if familiar with the subject matter.
2	Limited Working Performance	Unable to transfer information reliably in most instances. May communicate some meaning when exchanges are short, involve subject matter that is routine or discourse that is repetitive or predictable, but may typically require repetition or clarification. Expression in the target language is frequently faulty.
2+	Limited Working Performance Plus	Able to transfer information, not always accurately and completely, during routine, everyday, repetitive exchanges in informal settings, but unable to perform adequately in the standard interpretation modes. May falter, stammer, or pause, and often resort to summarizing speech content. Idiomatic or cultural expressions may not be rendered appropriately in most instances. Language may be stilted or awkward.
3	Professional Performance	Able to interpret consistently in the mode (simultaneous, consecutive, and sight) required by the setting, provide renditions of informal as well as some colloquial and formal speech with adequate accuracy, and normally meet unpredictable complications successfully. Can convey many nuances, cultural allusions, and idioms, though expression may not always reflect target language conventions. Adequate delivery, with pleasant voice quality. Hesitations, repetitions or corrections may be noticeable but do not hinder successful communication of the message. Can handle some specialized subject matter with preparation. Performance reflects high standards of professional conduct and ethics.

ILR level	Attribute	Description
3+	Professional Performance Plus	Able to interpret accurately and consistently in the mode (simultaneous, consecutive, and sight) required by the setting and provide generally accurate renditions of complex, colloquial and formal speech, conveying most details and nuances. Expression will generally reflect target language conventions. Demonstrates competence in the skills required for interpretation, including command of both working languages, their cultural context, and terminology in those specialized fields in which the interpreter has developed expertise. Good delivery, with pleasant voice quality, and few hesitations, repetitions, or corrections. Performance reflects high standards of professional conduct and ethics.
4	Advanced Professional Performance	Able to interpret in the mode (simultaneous, consecutive, and sight) required by the setting and provide almost completely accurate renditions of complex, colloquial, and idiomatic speech as well as formal and some highly formal discourse. Conveys the meaning of the speaker faithfully, including most if not all details and nuances, reflecting the style, register, and cultural context of the source language, without omissions, additions or embellishments. Demonstrates mastery of the skills required for interpretation, including command of both working languages and their cultural context, expertise in some specialized fields, and ability to prepare new specialized topics rapidly and routinely. Very good delivery, with pleasant voice quality and only occasional hesitations, repetitions or corrections. Performance reflects the highest standards of professional conduct and ethics.

ILR level	Attribute	Description
4+	Advanced Professional Performance Plus	Able to interpret in the mode (simultaneous, consecutive, and sight) required by the setting and provide accurate renditions of informal, formal, and most highly formal discourse. Conveys the meaning of the speaker faithfully and accurately, including virtually all details and nuances, reflecting the style, register, and cultural context of the source language, without omissions, additions or embellishments. Demonstrates mastery of the skills required for interpretation, including command of both working languages and their cultural context, expertise in a number of specialized fields, and ability to prepare other specialized topics rapidly and routinely. Excellent delivery, with pleasant voice quality and rare hesitations, repetitions or corrections. Performance reflects the highest standards of professional conduct and ethics.
5	Master Professional Performance	Able to excel consistently at interpreting in the mode (simultaneous, consecutive, and sight) required by the setting and provide accurate renditions of informal, formal, and highly formal discourse. Conveys the meaning of the speaker faithfully and accurately, including all details and nuances, reflecting the style, register, and cultural context of the source language, without omissions, additions or embellishments. Demonstrates superior command of the skills required for interpretation, including mastery of both working languages and their cultural context, and wide-ranging expertise in specialized fields. Outstanding delivery, with pleasant voice quality and without hesitations, unnecessary repetitions, and corrections. Exemplifies the highest standards of professional conduct and ethics.

**APPENDIX 3: KISH GRID FOR RANDOM SAMPLING**

Eligible people	Household					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	2	1	2	1	2
3	1	2	3	1	2	3
4	1	2	3	4	1	2
5	1	2	3	4	5	3
6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	1	2	3	4	5	6
$\geq 10$	1	2	3	4	5	6